

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
BENTON DIVISION**

Linden Reed,

Plaintiff,

v.

Stellar Recovery, Inc.; and
DOES 1-10, inclusive,

Defendants.

:
:
: Civil Action No.: 3:11-cv-00882
:
:

: **COMPLAINT**
:
:
:
:
:

For this Complaint, the Plaintiff, Linden Reed, by undersigned counsel, states as follows:

JURISDICTION

1. This action arises out of the Defendants' repeated violations of, *inter alia*, the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq. ("FDCPA"), and the invasions of the Plaintiff's personal privacy by the Defendants and their agents in their illegal efforts to collect a consumer debt.

2. Supplemental jurisdiction exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

3. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), in that the Defendants transact business in this District and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred in this District.

PARTIES

4. The Plaintiff, Linden Reed ("Plaintiff"), is an adult individual residing in Mt. Carmel, Illinois, and is a "consumer" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).

5. The Defendant, Stellar Recovery, Inc. (“Stellar”), is a Florida business entity with an address of 1845 US Highway 93 S Ste 310 Kalispell, Montana 59901, operating as a collection agency, and is a “debt collector” as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

6. Does 1-10 (the “Collectors”) are individual collectors employed by Stellar and whose identities are currently unknown to the Plaintiff. One or more of the Collectors may be joined as parties once their identities are disclosed through discovery.

7. Stellar at all times acted by and through one or more of the Collectors.

ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

A. The Debt

8. The Plaintiff incurred a financial obligation in the approximate amount of \$3,000.00 (the “Debt”) to Yamaha (the “Creditor”).

9. The Debt arose from services provided by the Creditor which were primarily for family, personal or household purposes and which meets the definition of a “debt” under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).

10. The Debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to Stellar for collection, or Stellar was employed by the Creditor to collect the Debt.

11. The Defendants attempted to collect the Debt and, as such, engaged in “communications” as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

B. Stellar Engages in Harassment and Abusive Tactics

12. Within the last year, Stellar contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect the Debt.

13. Stellar caused Plaintiff’s telephone to ring at inconvenient times, including

making calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone at 2:00 AM.

14. Stellar caused Plaintiff's telephone to ring at an excessive rate, placing daily calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone six (6) times per day.

15. Stellar threatened to take immediate legal action against Plaintiff if he did not immediately pay the Debt. To date, no such action has been filed.

16. Stellar threatened to place a lien against Plaintiff's home if he did not immediately pay the Debt. To date, no such action has taken place.

17. Stellar threatened to repossess Plaintiff's car if he did not immediately pay the Debt. To date, no such action has taken place.

18. Stellar when speaking with Plaintiff failed to inform Plaintiff that the call was an attempt to collect the Debt.

19. Stellar failed to inform Plaintiff of his rights under the state and federal laws by written correspondence within 5 days after the initial communication, including the right to dispute the debt.

C. Plaintiff Suffered Actual Damages

20. The Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer actual damages as a result of the Defendants' unlawful conduct.

21. As a direct consequence of the Defendants' acts, practices and conduct, the Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer from humiliation, anger, anxiety, emotional distress, fear, frustration and embarrassment.

COUNT I
VIOLATIONS OF THE FDCPA - 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq.

22. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

23. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(a)(1) in that Defendants contacted the Plaintiff at a place and during a time known to be inconvenient for the Plaintiff.

24. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(a)(1) in that Defendants contacted the Plaintiff before 8:00 a.m. and after 9:00 p.m.

25. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(5) in that Defendants caused a phone to ring repeatedly and engaged the Plaintiff in telephone conversations, with the intent to annoy and harass.

26. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(4) in that Defendants threatened the Plaintiff with seizure of his property if the Debt was not paid.

27. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(4) in that Defendants threatened the Plaintiff with attachment of his property if the Debt was not paid.

28. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(5) in that Defendants threatened to take legal action, without actually intending to do so.

29. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10) in that Defendants employed false and deceptive means to collect a debt.

30. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(11) in that Defendants failed to inform the consumer that the communication was an attempt to collect a debt.

31. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(1) in that Defendants failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice stating the amount of the Debt.

32. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(2) in that Defendants

failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice stating the name of the original creditor to whom the Debt was owed.

33. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(3) in that Defendants failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice stating the Plaintiff's right to dispute the Debt within thirty days.

34. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(4) in that Defendants failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice informing the Plaintiff of a right to have verification and judgment mailed to the Plaintiff.

35. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(5) in that Defendants failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice containing the name and address of the original creditor.

36. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendants constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including every one of the above-cited provisions.

37. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendants' violations.

COUNT II
VIOLATIONS OF THE ILLINOIS COLLECTION AGENCY ACT
225 ILCS 425/1, et seq.

38. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein at length.

39. A private right of action exists for violation of the ICAA. *Sherman v. Field Clinic*, 74 Ill. App. 3d 21, 392 N.E.2d 154 (1st Dist. 1979).

40. Stellar Recovery, Inc., in the regular course of business, engages in debt collection and is a "collection agency" as defined by 225 ILCS 425/2.02.

41. The Defendants' conduct violated 225 ILCS 425/9(a)(12) in that Defendants

threatened the seizure, attachment or sale of the Plaintiff's property where such action can only be taken pursuant to court order without disclosing that prior court proceedings are required.

42. The Defendants' conduct violated 225 ILCS 425/9(a)(15)(D) in that Defendants caused a telephone to ring or engaged the Plaintiff in telephone conversation repeatedly or continuously with intent to annoy, abuse, or harass.

43. The Defendants' conduct violated 225 ILCS 425/9(a)(31) in that Defendants engaged in dishonorable, unethical, or unprofessional conduct of a character likely to deceive, defraud, or harm the public.

44. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendants constitute numerous and multiple violations of the Illinois Collections Agency Act, including every one of the above-cited provisions.

45. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendants' violations.

COUNT III
INVASION OF PRIVACY BY INTRUSION INTO PRIVATE AFFAIRS

46. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

47. The Restatement of Torts, Second, § 652(b) defines intrusion upon seclusion as, "One who intentionally intrudes...upon the solitude or seclusion of another, or his private affairs or concerns, is subject to liability to the other for invasion of privacy, if the intrusion would be highly offensive to a reasonable person."

48. Illinois further recognizes the Plaintiff's right to be free from invasions of privacy, thus the Defendants violated Illinois state law.

49. The Defendants intentionally intruded upon the Plaintiff's right to privacy by

continually harassing the Plaintiff with the above-referenced telephone calls.

50. The telephone calls made by the Defendants to the Plaintiff were so persistent and repeated with such frequency as to be considered, “hounding the plaintiff,” and, “a substantial burden to her existence,” thus satisfying the Restatement of Torts, Second, § 652(b) requirement for an invasion of privacy.

51. The conduct of the Defendants in engaging in the illegal collection activities resulted in multiple invasions of privacy in such a way as would be considered highly offensive to a reasonable person.

52. As a result of the intrusions and invasions, the Plaintiff is entitled to actual damages in an amount to be determined at trial from the Defendants.

53. All acts of the Defendants and its agents were committed with malice, intent, wantonness, and recklessness, and as such, the Defendants are subject to punitive damages.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff respectfully prays that judgment be awarded in the Plaintiff’s favor and against the Defendants as follows:

1. Against the named the Defendants, jointly and severally, awarding the Plaintiff actual damages;
2. Against each of the named the Defendants, awarding the Plaintiff statutory damages;
3. Against the named Defendants, jointly and severally, awarding the Plaintiff recovery of the costs of litigation and reasonable attorney’s fees ;

4. Against the named the Defendants, jointly and severally, awarding the Plaintiff punitive damages in such amount as is found appropriate; and

5. Granting the Plaintiff such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS

Dated: September 28, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Sergei Lemberg
Sergei Lemberg, Esq.
CT Bar # 425027
LEMBERG & ASSOCIATES L.L.C.
A Connecticut Law Firm
1100 Summer Street, 3rd Floor
Stamford, CT 06905
Telephone: (203) 653-2250
Facsimile: (203) 653-3424